

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA  
ROANOKE DIVISION**

LEONARDO URREA, and	)	
APRIL URREA,	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	
	)	
v.	)	No. 7:17cv00016
	)	
OCWEN LOAN SERVICING, LLC,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

**PLAINTIFFS' COMPLAINT**

Plaintiffs, LEONARDO URREA and APRIL URREA, ("Plaintiffs") file this lawsuit for damages, and other legal and equitable remedies, resulting from the illegal actions of OCWEN LOAN SERVICING, LLC ("Defendant"), as detailed as follows.

**INTRODUCTION**

1. Plaintiffs' Complaint is based on the Telephone Consumer Protection Act., 47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq. ("TCPA").

**JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

2. Jurisdiction in this court is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 as Plaintiffs' claims arise under the laws of the United States.
3. This court has federal question jurisdiction because this case arises out of violations of federal law. 47 U.S.C. § 227(b); *Mims v. Arrow Fin. Servs., LLC*, 132 S. Ct. 740 (2012).
4. Defendant conducts business in Roanoke, Virginia.

5. Venue and personal jurisdiction in this District are proper because Defendant transacts business in this District, and a material portion of the events at issue occurred in this District.

### **PARTIES**

6. Plaintiffs are residents of Roanoke, Virginia.
7. Defendant is based in West Palm Beach, Florida.

### **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

8. Within four (4) years of Plaintiffs filing this Complaint, Defendant called Plaintiffs' cellular telephone numbers 540-397-5526 and 540-397-5527 to collect on Plaintiffs' alleged debt.
9. All of the telephone calls Defendant made to Plaintiffs were an attempt to collect on Plaintiffs' alleged debt.
10. None of the calls Defendant made to Plaintiff were for an emergency purpose.
11. Within the past four (4) years, Plaintiff has requested numerous times for the Defendant to stop calling Plaintiffs' cellular telephone numbers.
12. Despite Plaintiffs' requests that Defendant stop calling Plaintiffs' cellular telephones, Defendant continued to call Plaintiffs' cellular telephones.
13. Prior to calling Plaintiffs' cellular telephones, Defendant knew the numbers were cellular telephone numbers.
14. All of the calls Defendant made to Plaintiffs' cellular telephones resulted in Plaintiffs incurring charges for incoming calls.
15. During at least one conversation, Defendant learned that Plaintiffs wanted Defendant to stop calling Plaintiffs' cellular telephones.

16. Even if at one point Defendant had permission to call Plaintiffs' cellular telephones, Plaintiffs revoked this consent.
17. Defendant continued to call Plaintiffs' cellular telephones after Defendant knew Plaintiffs wanted the calls to stop.
18. Within four (4) years of Plaintiffs filing this Complaint, Defendant used an automatic telephone dialing system to call Plaintiffs' cellular telephones.
19. Within four (4) years of Plaintiffs filing this Complaint, Defendant called Plaintiffs' cellular telephones in predictive mode.
20. Within four (4) years of Plaintiffs filing this Complaint, Defendant left prerecorded voicemail messages for Plaintiffs' on Plaintiffs' cellular telephones.
21. The telephone dialer system Defendant used to call Plaintiffs' cellular telephones has the capacity to store telephone numbers.
22. The telephone dialer system Defendant used to call Plaintiffs' cellular telephones has the capacity to call stored telephone numbers automatically.
23. The telephone dialer system Defendant used to call Plaintiffs' cellular telephones has the capacity to call stored telephone numbers without human intervention.
24. The telephone dialer system Defendant used to call Plaintiffs' cellular telephones has the capacity to call telephone numbers in sequential order.
25. The telephone dialer system Defendant used to call Plaintiffs' cellular telephones has the capacity to call telephone numbers randomly.
26. The telephone dialer system Defendant used to call Plaintiffs' cellular telephones selects telephone numbers to be called according to a protocol or strategy entered by Defendant.
27. The telephone dialer system Defendant used to call Plaintiffs' cellular telephones

simultaneously calls multiple consumers.

28. While Defendant called Plaintiffs' cellular telephones, Plaintiffs' cellular telephone lines were unavailable for legitimate use during the unwanted calls.

**COUNT I:  
DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE  
TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT**

29. Defendant's conduct violated the TCPA by:

- a. Placing non-emergency telephone calls to Plaintiffs' cellular telephones using an automatic telephone dialing system and/or pre-recorded or artificial voice in violation of 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b)(1)(A)(iii).

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs, LEONARDO URREA and APRIL URREA, respectfully request that judgment be entered against Defendant, OCWEN LOAN SERVICING, for the following:

30. As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1), Plaintiffs are entitled to and request \$500.00 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).
31. As a result of Defendant's willful and/or knowing violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1), Plaintiffs are entitled to and request treble damages, as provided by statute, up to \$1,500.00, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B) and 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C).
32. Plaintiffs are entitled to and seek injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

33. Any other relief that this Honorable Court deems appropriate.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

January 12, 2017

By: /s/ Richard W. Ferris  
Richard W. Ferris, Esq.  
Virginia bar number 31812  
Attorney for Plaintiffs  
Ferris Winder, PLLC  
530 East Main St. Suite 300  
Richmond, VA 23219  
Phone: (804) 767-1800  
Fax: (888) 251-6228  
rwferris@ferriswinder.com